

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above amendment to the specification reflects the previously submitted claim to priority as shown on the filing receipt. As such, no new matter is added, and its entry appears proper.

The amendments to claims 1, 15 and 17 add a new characterization element directed to gel content. This amendment is supported at page 2, line 15 of the specification. The remaining amendments to claim 1 are intended only to improve the read-ability of the claim. As such it is respectfully submitted that these amendments do not add new matter and their entry is therefore courteously requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for examining the claims of group III from the previous restriction.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 11-25 under 35 USC §112 second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner has pointed out specific technical inaccuracies in claim 1 caused by imprecise language, which leads to indefiniteness. Applicants have attempted to correct this problem by amending claim 1. Accordingly Applicants courteously request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also objected to the use of the phrase "TMA temperature" stating that "TMA is used to measure a number of characteristics of materials. Applicants point out that page 11, line 30 specifically defines what is meant by "TMA temperature". As such, it is respectfully submitted that this phrase is not indefinite in the context of this application. Accordingly Applicants believe that incorporating the test method described at page 11 lines 26-31 is unnecessary and would make the claim unwieldy, but are willing to consider any suggestion the Examiner may have in this regard.

Claims 1-6 and 11-25 are also rejected under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Torres et al. (US 2004/0116610). Torres teaches grafting of a polyolefin backbone with a "mono-functional type oligomer with a predetermined chain length, with a low polydispersity index and an absolutely controlled structure..." (Claim 1 and [0118 - 0121]). These oligomers are made [0122] "by one of the processes selected among those using a: [0123] redox or radical telomerisation method, [0124] or a controlled radical

polymerisation method. Such polymerization methods will result in polymers having T_g greater than -10°C , and thus would be outside the range recited in the claims. It is also believed that the high temperature radical polymerization methods taught by Torres will lead to cross-linking and therefore gel weight fractions of more than 10%. This is a second reason why the materials of Torres do not destroy patentability of the present claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims based on Torres be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-6 and 11-25 are also rejected under 35 USC §102 (b) as anticipated or under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Kojoh (EP1270647). Kojoh teaches methods beginning at paragraph [0249] which will result in modified polyolefins which will have bifunctionality. The bifunctionality will lead to increased crosslinking, resulting in a gel content greater than 10%. Thus, this reference also fails to destroy patentability of the present claims.

Claims 1-5 and 11-25 are also rejected under 35 USC §102 (e) as anticipated or under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Krom (US7,056,979). Krom teaches the use of dienes (see claim 1) and thus would not produce a side chain derived from an olefin, as recited in the claims. Thus this reference is not relevant to the patentability of the present claims.

Accordingly, as none of the references cited by the Examiner makes anticipates or makes obvious the composition as presently claimed these rejections are courteously requested to be reconsidered and withdrawn, and a notice of allowance promptly issued.

Respectfully submitted,

/James T. Hoppe/

James T. Hoppe

Registration No. 35,899

Phone: 979-238-9039

P. O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967

JTH/mr